

NPS ARCHIVE
1965
YEOMAN, M.

A STUDY OF THE INTRODUCTION OF ROLE PLAYING
INTO THE LEADERSHIP PROGRAM OF A
NAVAL SHORE ACTIVITY

MARJORIE A. YEOMAN

DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY
NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
MONTEREY CA 93943-5101

U.S. FEDERAL
MON

RECEIVED
JAN 10 1984

A STUDY OF THE INTRODUCTION OF ROLE PLAYING
INTO THE LEADERSHIP PROGRAM
OF A NAVAL SHORE ACTIVITY

* * * * *

M. A. YEOMAN

A STUDY OF THE INTRODUCTION OF ROLE PLAYING
INTO THE LEADERSHIP PROGRAM
OF A NAVAL SHORE ACTIVITY

by

Marjorie A. Yeoman
Lieutenant, United States Navy

Submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE IN MANAGEMENT

United States Naval Postgraduate School

Monterey, California

1 9 6 5

A STUDY OF THE INTRODUCTION OF ROLE PLAYING
INTO THE LEADERSHIP PROGRAM
OF A NAVAL SHORE ACTIVITY

by

Marjorie A. Yeoman

This work is accepted as fulfilling
the research paper requirements for the degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE IN MANAGEMENT

from the
United States Naval Postgraduate School

ABSTRACT

Role playing is a leadership training technique which attempts to simulate experience by doing as well as saying. This type of training has been used extensively in industry with varying results. Recently the American Institute of Research prepared for the Navy the research report upon which this study was based. The AIR report included a number of role playing cases and the procedures to be followed in using these cases. The researcher used the procedures recommended and, working with a group of six Chief Petty Officers inexperienced in role playing, conducted a series of four role playing sessions. While the leadership program was moderately successful in itself, it was primarily valuable in pointing out the pitfalls to be avoided by the novice in the use of role playing for leadership training in a practical situation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION		PAGE
I	Background	1
II	Importance of Human Relations Skills	2
III	The Problem	4
IV	Role Playing	5
V	Advantages and Disadvantages of Role Playing	11
VI	The Study	13
VII	Summary	22
VIII	Conclusions	23
IX	Future Uses	27
BIBLIOGRAPHY		30
APPENDIXES		
A.	LIST OF SITUATIONAL PROBLEMS	33
B.	SAMPLE ROLE PLAYING SITUATIONAL PROBLEMS	35
C.	DIRECTIONS FOR ADMINISTRATION OF PROBLEMS	41
D.	INSTRUCTIONS TO PARTICIPANTS	42
E.	PROCEDURES FOR ADMINISTERING PROBLEMS	44
F.	GENERAL DISCUSSION GUIDE FOR USE WITH ROLE PLAYING GROUPS	47
G.	SAMPLE CASE STUDY	48
H.	BACKGROUND QUESTIONNAIRE	50
I.	SELF-EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE	51
J.	TERMINAL QUESTIONNAIRE	52

I. Background

Frederick Winslow Taylor's application of scientific principles to the management process around the turn of the century resulted in many forms of improved work methods. His work was followed by that of the Gilbreths who also devoted their attention to methods and were responsible for some of the same work methods found today in modern industrial engineering.

These engineers did not entirely overlook the human element in their work with methods but they did view the human element as more of a constant than a variable.

During the 1920's and '30's, the Hawthorne studies gave real impetus to the humanistic school of thought and the realization that management's most important resource, manpower, which had been taken for granted for so long was in reality an enigma (Litterer, 1963). The challenge of understanding this enigma is still with us and it is to meet this challenge that we must use every human relations skill at our disposal.

Human relations is not the problem of any one organization or type of organization. Every group of individuals, no matter how large or small, with an objective, should seek to attain that objective with the most efficient use of the resources available. Just as the gears of a machine must mesh, so human efforts must also be coordinated. Division of labor and specialization can be successfully coordinated on paper when a formal organization is drawn up, but putting these same theories of

coordination into practice is an entirely different chore. Every organization can be viewed as having vertical and horizontal divisions, and coordination between these vertical and horizontal levels can be thought of as the cement that binds the bricks of a structure together. Each element of the organization is important only as it relates to other elements; no one element is important in itself. Coordination, a function of leadership, has been called one of the most important and most difficult functions of organization and is important at every level of the organization (Litterer, 1963).

II. Importance of human relations skills

Argyris, in his book Personality and Organization (1963) states:

Anyone who aspires to positions of power over people in organizations, if he is to succeed, is responsible for becoming more aware of his self and the systematic knowledge that exists about human behavior; he needs to become proficient in human skill in living (e.g., the ability to listen, to diagnose human situations, and to help himself and others become more aware of their involvement in human situations). Basic to these requirements, the individual must develop a philosophy of life and of leadership which is thought through to the point where it can be used to guide him in his behavior under varying conditions; to evaluate his and others' behavior; and to guide him to seek new knowledge about and understanding of human behavior.

As for the practical applications of human relations skills, Rensis Likert discusses trends in modern leadership theory and studies of variables affecting production, absence, turnover, and job satisfaction. One of the findings of these studies (which take in a wide variety of industries) concerns

the employees-centered supervisor as opposed to the production-centered supervisor. Likert states that significantly more often the employee-centered supervisors get better production, better morale and better worker satisfaction than their production-centered counterparts. He also states that employee-centered supervisors who get the best results recognize that production is a main goal (Fleishman, 1961).

Granted that human relations skills are important to the supervisor, the next question would be: "What is being done to train supervisors in these human relations skills?" This sort of training does pose some problems, because it involves more than classroom lectures, reading assignments, or blackboard diagrams. Maier and Zerfross (1952) say:

To be effective, training in the skills must be accompanied by attitude and feeling changes. A supervisor who does not respect his employees will have difficulty in practicing effective methods because his approaches will not hide his basic attitude. It is because skills and attitudes are so interdependent in personnel work that training methods must incorporate both.

It is pertinent to note here that in a survey conducted by the publication Advanced Management, over one-half of 125 medium-sized companies surveyed stated that they had programs for the training of supervisors in human relations skills, and of those programs 73% were conducted by company personnel. This same article states that a survey by the University of Texas ranked the types of human relations training programs used by the companies surveyed in this order: (1) lectures, (2) case histories, (3) films and sound slides, (4) the

critical incident method, (5) psychological discussions, (6) role playing (Corsini, 1960).

Historically the military has been one of this country's greatest producers of leaders. No less than industry, the military today takes great interest and participates in research carried on in the behavioral sciences, realizing that much can be gained from the understanding of behavior that is gathered through social scientific research.

It is of interest that in 1957, of 15,000 members of the American Psychological Association, 729 of these psychologists were working for agencies of the military departments. This number constitutes almost 5% of the total membership, as compared with 2% of the membership in 1948 working for the military services (Melton, 1961).

These figures represent just one of many areas of the behavioral sciences. It is hoped that they indicate somewhat the emphasis placed on the behavioral sciences by the military.

III. The Problem

This paper reports a study of the translation of some of these research findings into practical every day theories for the military officer whose main concern is leadership. After reviewing the available literature on role-playing, and a wide spectrum of writings on leadership in general, the researcher selected the report on situational problems for leadership training turned out by the American Institute for Research for the Office of Naval Research (Trittipoe & Hahn, 1961). This

four-part report constituted the basis of the study conducted by the researcher. Briefly the study was carried out at the Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Monterey, California. Six Chief Petty Officers were used as subjects. Four sessions were conducted. Under these circumstances, with the time constraint and personnel limitations, it was deemed virtually impossible to have enough statistical data available to prove or disprove any specific hypotheses. The purpose of the study was to put together, (1) the pre-packaged role playing situations developed by AIR, (2) a group leader inexperienced in the conducting of role playing sessions, and (3) a group of six Chief Petty Officers who had never been exposed to role playing before, and see if a successful role playing program could be developed.

Primarily the researcher was looking for things to be avoided, and the most practical plan of action to be followed if this program were to be developed and used as a division or departmental level leadership program.

IV. Role Playing

Role playing was first used by Moreno in the treatment of the mentally disturbed. At that time it was called psychodrama. In the years since, role playing has been used in many other situations such as interviewing selection, speech adjustment, sales training, leadership training, and supervisory training (Maier, 1952).

The main reason for the extensive and varied use of role

playing is that it is a flexible technique with no set rules and can be readily adapted to suit the need. Basically role playing is a situational type training in which trainees are the actors in the situations involving conflict. Starting with a given situation, the participants carry out assigned roles with the objective of resolving the conflict or reaching an understanding with the other participants.

The assigned roles may be those of both supervisors or subordinates and the emphasis is on carrying out an assigned attitude in a spontaneous manner, just as though that attitude were yours. For example, a typical role playing session may involve six trainees and a discussion leader. In this particular case the discussion leader may have a prepared case which is pertinent to the working situation but is not a specific problem (i.e.: one which can be identified with specific individuals known to the group). This problem may have three roles which would be assigned to three trainees and the remaining three would be observers for this particular case. After the actors have read their parts, they attempt to maintain their assigned roles, and through interaction reach an understanding with the other participants. When the conflict is resolved, or the discussion leader calls time, the participants and the observers analyze and discuss the situation and how it was handled. Then the same case may be done again with the observers and the actors changing places, or perhaps with the three actors doing the same case again in different roles.

Maier (1952) points out the variations that provide the flexibility of role playing:

- (1) The extent to which a person is himself may be varied.
- (2) Problems may be set up so that conflicts can be resolved and thus end in some kind of agreement or understanding, or they may be set up without there being any intention of reaching a solution. In the latter type the discussion leader terminates the role playing whenever he feels certain conflicts have come to expression.
- (3) How much reversal of roles takes place also depends upon the training objective.
- (4) The question of whether the leader should supply role playing situations, or whether the group themselves should supply specific real-life problems they must resolve depends on the need and objectives of the training.
- (5) After roles are played there is also the problem of deciding how much of an analysis of the role playing session should be made.

In spite of the infinite variety of role playing techniques, there has been a tendency to categorize several of the better-known types as follows:

Multiple role playing - This method is used in training a large group which divides into smaller groups to do role playing and then meets with the original group for discussion and analysis.

Single group role playing - This method is best with a smaller, more advanced group. One role playing group performs while all others observe (Maier, 1957).

Skit completion method - While other types of role-playing merely set the stage, this type uses a skit to carry the action to the point of conflict.

Dramatized case method - This method depends on the treatment of previous incidents for which dialogue is written. This dialogue provides the roles (Maier, 1957).

Mirror technique - After an individual plays a role, he observes while another person attempts to do the role in the same manner as the original player.

Inner thoughts - A & B act out roles and C stands behind B (or A) and verbalizes what might be the hidden meaning behind the spoken words (Corsini, 1960).

Substitution method - Some players take roles while others play themselves. Mid-session, one player who is playing himself is replaced by another who also plays himself (Speroff, 1959).

Measuring effectiveness -

John H. Mann has written, perhaps the most striking impression to be gained from a review of the experimental studies of role playing is their scarcity (Mann, 1956). While there is not an over-abundance of evidence proving or disproving the effectiveness of role playing, there is sufficient information to provide examples of results. This evidence will be presented here by type of measurement used and case.

Scientific investigation

Culbertson (1957) in investigating the use of role playing in changing an emotionally-loaded attitude found that significant changes of attitude did occur. The role playing session involved Negro integration in housing with all roles

pro-Negro, and the results showed a shift in attitude toward the integration of Negroes in housing as well as toward the Negro. The degree of change was greater for those people who had greater involvement in the session; that is, the attitudes of the role players changed more than the attitudes of the observers.

Reduction of grievances

Speroff reports on one large company which was having a great deal of trouble with one specific division which was the source of a great many grievance problems. After 18 months of sending in a variety of labor relations men and making no significant progress, the decision was made to try role playing with the labor relations men. The first efforts were with "Mirror" role playing. After a session had been completed, an attempt was made to duplicate the session with other players so that the original players could see how they themselves looked. However, this method failed due to the inability of the players to duplicate exactly one another's actions, attitudes, etc. Then the "Substitution" method was used, in which one labor relations counselor, X, played the union representative with a personality pattern similar to that of the real union representative. Labor relations counselor A would play himself with X for part of the session until he was replaced by labor relations counselor B, also playing himself. This technique was considered successful by the company and four months later, follow-up data showed that each succeeding

month had shown a drop of $1\frac{1}{2}\%$ in the number of grievances (Speroff, 1959).

Performance

One of the most frequently referred to examples of the use of role playing is in the case of the United Parcel Company. The company's training expert, Charles Foreman, refers to their use of role playing as the "empty bucket principle" and says that men must first be emptied of their negative and defeatist attitudes before they can start building up constructive solutions and principles. This company sought to reduce the number of undelivered packages brought back by the drivers and after running an orthodox campaign the number of undelivered packages dropped by 9%. The company then had the supervisors of the drivers go through role playing sessions, with some of the supervisors playing drivers and others playing supervisors. After looking at the problem from the drivers' point of view the supervisors renewed the drive and further reduced the number of undeliverables from 9% to 23%.

This company also made use of the role playing technique when the supervisory personnel were faced with the problem of getting unionized drivers to accept equipment in their trucks which would record and time all stops and delays en-route. Through role-playing the supervisors determined how they would react to different approaches if they were the drivers. By looking at the problem from the drivers' point of view they were able to induce the drivers to accept the

equipment without incurring the wrath of the union.

Opinion Surveys

Lawshe has reported the results of a survey conducted by the Occupational Research Center of Purdue University. In this research project three groups of supervisors, a total of 45 people, went through four role-playing sessions as part of a human relations training program. At the conclusion of the program, the trainees were asked to fill out questionnaires, and Lawshe presents the following summary of responses:

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
(1) Does role playing "put you on the spot?"	25%	75%
(2) Everyone in management should have some role playing	88%	12%
(3) Role playing would be a good experience for my boss.	68%	32%
(4) More role playing in the future would be a good thing.	79%	21%
(5) Does role playing help you to think of different ways to carry out decisions?	83%	17%
(6) Role playing helps you to see the other person's point of view.	89%	11%

(Lawshe, Brune and Bolda, Nov. 1958)

V. Advantages and Disadvantages of Role Playing

Maier (1952) has set forth the values of role playing and the most significant of these are summarized below.

Role Playing

(1) provides the bridge between knowing and doing, thereby facilitating action when a situation requires it. This factor also points out that what people preach and practice may be two different things;

(2) requires the trainee to recognize and analyze his own behavior and attitudes, certainly a prerequisite to a change in behavior;

(3) causes the trainee to recognize that others have different attitudes and opinions and these differences may manifest themselves in different types of behavior;

(4) provides an interesting and practical illustration of the need for human relations skills;

(5) demonstrates that often it is not what is done but how it is done that counts;

(6) develops additional skills in problem-solving, leadership, and interviewing. Because of the overlap between these allied areas, any given technique is likely to result in (beneficial) side-effects;

(7) is flexible.

Of course, role playing is not without its disadvantages.

Role playing

(1) is time-consuming (Maier, 1952);

(2) requires trained leaders for maximum benefits (Maier, 1952);

(3) may cause embarrassment to some trainees (Hepner, 1962);

- (4) requires that certain aptitudes must be present in the trainees (Maier, 1952).

Although Maier refers to the seven points listed above as values, it is perhaps better to regard them as objectives, since they often represent the optimum rather than the realistic.

There have not been a great number of studies conducted which evaluate the effectiveness of role playing as a training technique. However, existing evidence does show role playing to be effective under the right circumstances.

VI. The Study

Purpose

The purpose of this study as stated earlier was to take role playing materials prepared for use in leadership training programs for petty officers and actually use these materials in a command leadership program. Since the materials in question have been developed under more or less clinical conditions, the question to be answered was, what problems are encountered in introducing these materials into the practical situation? Can a discussion leader untrained and inexperienced in role playing techniques use these materials?

A secondary purpose of the researcher was to gather enough first-hand experience to be able to set up guidelines for further applications of role playing training both for the researcher and others who may wish to make use of the material.

Locale

The research done in connection with this paper was conducted at the Naval Auxiliary Landing Field located in

Monterey, California. The primary mission of this activity is to provide the aviation facilities for the large number of Naval Aviators attending the nearby U.S. Naval Postgraduate School. At the time of the study the activity had an on-board count of approximately 26 officers and 460 enlisted. Of this number, approximately 34 were Chief Petty Officers.

NALF Monterey is commanded by a Captain. At the time of the last Administration and Materiel Inspection, the activity received an overall grade of Excellent.

When the subject of this research was broached, the command was quite receptive and granted permission for the study to be carried on using station personnel and station facilities.

The above information is provided in order to indicate the type of leadership climate observed at the time the research was being conducted.

Selection of Subjects

In deciding upon the number of subjects to be used in the study sessions, several items had to be considered. First, because of time limitations and the fact that only one researcher was working on the project, it was desired that the group used be small enough to assure 100% attendance at all sessions. Secondly, it was desired that the sessions not have disruptive effects on the command's regular routine and activities. Accordingly, it was decided to use six subjects.

In requesting these subjects from the command, literally no criteria was set by the researcher except that the subjects

be Chiefs or First Class Petty Officers, and that they not be vehemently opposed to participation in the project. The command selected the six subjects and informed them of the time and the place of the first session which was the first time the researcher met the subjects. The subjects represented a variety of rates and lengths of service, as shown below:

Aviation Structural Mechanic	E-9	26 years of service
Aviation Structural Mechanic	E-8	24 years of service
Aviation Machinists Mate	E-8	29 years of service
Quartermaster	E-8	24 years of service
Aviation Technician	E-7	14 years of service
Signalman	E-7	14 years of service

Description of materials prepared by AIR

The general purpose of the research conducted by the American Institute for Research was (1) to develop and (2) evaluate materials for use by petty officers in leadership training. The specific approach was to develop situational problems "relevant to on-the-job performance especially in the use of human relations skills." An additional objective was to compile for the use of petty officers a summary of problems, results and trends in leadership research. The project also included the compilation of a bibliography of recent research in leadership.

Organizationally, the report was presented in four parts (Trittipoe and Hahn, 1961):

Part I:	Development and Evaluation of Situational Problems
Part II:	Situational Problems for Role Playing and Case Study Use
Part III:	Review for Petty Officers of Leadership Research

Part IV Categorized Bibliography of Leadership
Research Literature

As a point of departure, AIR solicited by questionnaire reports of critical incidents from petty officers in the Norfolk, Virginia, area. These situations or incidents fell into eight categories (Trittipoe and Hahn, 1961):

- Making work assignments and schedules
- Supervising work gang activities
- Relations between officers and petty officers; petty officers and other petty officers,* and petty officers and non-rated men
- Training subordinates and peers
- AOL/AWOL
- Technical competence
- Personal actions
- Personal actions in fulfilling job responsibilities

The incidents reported and the categories into which they were divided were then used as a basis for the development of situational problems. The first set of problem materials developed were informally tried out with a small group of petty officers and then revised, dropping some problems and adding others. Using these revised problems, the researchers conducted a series of more formal sessions at Pensacola, Florida, and through a series of critiques, arrived at a refined form of the situational problems. A list and brief description of these situational problems is attached as Appendix I.

Appendix II is a sample problem and is one that was actually used in one of the role playing sessions done for this research. These problems in their final form were judged to be realistic and more of an exercise in human relations and communications skills than in decision-making although

decisions were required in all problems. In addition to the problem itself, each case contained one or more check lists to aid observers in their evaluation of behavior displayed during the sessions. Appendixes III, IV, V and VI are the instructions given to the group leaders and participants in the use of the role playing materials.

Part II of the AIR Report also contains the same problems in Case Study form and a sample is included as Appendix VII.

Description of sessions

Prior to the start of the role playing sessions, it was decided by the researcher to conduct four two-hour sessions, a week apart. At the beginning of the first session this time schedule was announced and a suitable day of the week was decided upon by the group. In order to break the ice and to obtain some background material, the researcher had the group fill out the two questionnaires included as Appendix VIII and IX. Then the concept and techniques of role playing were explained briefly to the group. The questionnaires showed that none of the participants had ever been exposed to the role playing technique before, but all felt they needed additional training in this area.

Several points relevant to the prevailing climate of the sessions should be mentioned here. The researcher did not know any of the subjects prior to the sessions and had never been attached to the command involved. In order to promote an informal atmosphere the researcher attended the sessions in

civilian clothes. Furthermore, the performance of the cases and some of the discussions were taped and while this may have caused some inhibition, it was considered worth while to have a record of the proceedings.

The situations used were selected by the researcher from the basic materials described earlier. Some of the situations called for two participants and some called for three. The group was arranged around a square table and the participants in the sessions moved to the corner of the table near the microphone while they were performing their case. All others observed.

The cases were not discussed nor distributed prior to the assignment of roles, so that participants would see only their own roles.

Each situation has one role for a chief who is in the position of having to solve the problem, the other roles are those of antagonists. Ordinarily the situation was described in the roles as shown in Appendix II. The observers were provided with a copy of all the roles and the appropriate check lists.

The first session indicated that two cases could be easily discussed in one two-hour period. In the opinion of the researcher this seemed to be sufficient time for a thorough discussion and yet not an excess of time, particularly if the discussion was carefully paced by the group leader.

An attempt was made to give each participant an equal

number of the main roles. Since only eight cases were used and there were six participants, several cases were replayed immediately with different people, or roles were switched in the middle of the case. This provided an opportunity to see the different approaches to the same problem, and yet was not so time-consuming as introducing a new case would have been.

The attitude of the subjects toward this project was in general willing, occasionally bordering on enthusiasm, perhaps due to the novelty of the situation. The tone of the sessions was consistent through the four sessions. The subjects appeared anxious to discuss leadership but frequently displayed the attitude that it was a fairly cut and dried subject. The researcher rarely had to enter the discussion except to introduce new phases of the case for discussion.

The performance of roles was for the most part methodical and rather uninspired. The role players conscientiously performed their parts but had considerable difficulty in portraying a character or role dissimilar to their own. It appeared to the researcher that the group did not consider the attitudes displayed by the antagonists unrealistic. However, in playing the role of the antagonist a subject would often perform the role in more of a "nice guy" manner than was intended. Although this point was mentioned frequently, subjects tended to correct the behavior of the antagonists as they played the role rather than force the unpleasantness of the situation. In this manner attitude problems usually evolved into decision-making problems and were terminated

once a decision was made or plan of action decided upon.

Another difficulty encountered was the inability of the group to accept the background or setting of the case as given. Often the group seized upon what were meant to be insignificant details and conjured up suppositions completely irrelevant to the case. An example of this occurred in a case which mentioned a heater aboard an aircraft which was making a test hop. The situation dealt with the crew chief who failed to secure the heater through negligence and thus caused an emergency landing. The point of the case was that the chief's men lost faith in him because of his negligence, but the group discussion soon centered on what type of aircraft and what type of heater was involved and if that particular type of heater really could have caused an emergency situation.

Once the players indicated that the role playing was terminated, a general discussion was held with comments from the entire group. Criticism was freely given and suggestions for improvements offered. The discussion portion of the sessions was the most revealing in regard to the attitudes toward methods of leadership. It was observed that the younger men had the most authoritarian views of leadership while the older more senior men usually defended the human relations point of view.

In a number of instances, subjects expressed the view that they were torn between playing a role in the "expected" manner and the way they would handle it in an actual situation. In the discussions it sometimes appeared that some of the subjects

thought of the authoritarian approach and human relations approach as two separate clearly-defined roles. It was frequently mentioned by other observers that the correct approach was usually somewhere on the continuum between the two.

At the conclusion of the fourth and final session, the researcher had the group fill out the questionnaire shown as Appendix IX. The subjects indicated on the questionnaires that they considered the role playing sessions satisfactory. The two recommendations for improvements were (1) to make the problems more difficult or complicated, and (2) provide problems that have one correct solution so that the group would know if they had solved the problem correctly.

In rating their peers in leadership ability as displayed at the sessions, four of the six subjects listed as the top man a subject who had been rated fourth by the researcher. This same man was listed by three of the men as first in on-the-job leadership ability. During the sessions this man was quite reticent and more passive than most of the other participants.

In ranking the categories of problem areas in order of their importance, the group arrived at the following:

1. Relations between officers and petty officers
2. Personal actions in fulfilling job responsibilities
3. Relations between petty officers and other petty officers
4. Emergency actions
5. Supervising work gang activities

6. Making work assignments and schedules
7. Technical competence
8. Training subordinates and peers
9. Relations between petty officers and non-rated men
10. AOL/AWOL

At least one participant expressed the desire to the researcher and the station administrative officer to have the role playing session offered on a continuous basis as part of the station leadership program.

VII. Summary

One of the major challenges facing the military leader is and always has been getting the job done with the manpower available. Few military leaders are born knowing all the facets of leadership. In most cases frequent training is necessary to augment the natural ability of the leader. Certainly experience contributes to leadership ability. Role playing is a leadership training technique which attempts to simulate experience by doing as well as saying. This sort of training has been used extensively by industry with varying results. Recently the American Insitutute of Research prepared for the Navy the research report upon which this project was based.

The AIR report included a number of role playing cases and the procedures to be followed in using these cases. The researcher used the procedures recommended and working with a group of six Chief Petty Officers inexperienced in role playing conducted a series of four role playing sessions. While the

leadership program was moderately successful in itself, it was primarily valuable in pointing out the pitfalls to be avoided by the novice in the use of role playing for leadership training in a practical situation.

VIII. Conclusions

Role playing has several unique qualities not always found in other types of leadership training. The actual role playing is enough of a gimmick to hold the attention of the observers and the players are personally involved. As a result, no matter how poorly the role playing may have progressed the group discussion that follows is usually more lively than if it had not been introduced by role playing.

By playing a role in a certain manner a participant provokes questions regarding his reasons for that certain approach. Thus the question of attitudes usually comes to the fore quite early in the discussion.

This pattern usually develops quite naturally without any special effort on the part of the leader. This enables an inexperienced group leader to get a group started with role playing with only a minimum of background information and the basic materials used for this project.

The real challenge to the leader is the development of good role players and good situations. This makes the difference between a somewhat ordinary leadership program and one that offers real insight into attitudinal problems.

As a result of this project the researcher has a number

of recommendations for improving future uses of role playing. The group used for this project was extremely senior (except for two men) and in the opinion of the researcher, relatively inflexible. It would appear more fruitful to use younger, less experienced petty officers who do not have their attitudes so firmly entrenched. Some sessions should be tried with a mixed group, chiefs and first-class, or chiefs and junior officers, for instance.

It is definitely advised that any role playing program be started with an example of an animated, well-performed situation in order to set a standard for the sessions to follow. This sample performance can be taped or done by several people who have rehearsed ahead of time.

The situations provided by the AIR report revolve for the most part around interaction between petty officers. The rating of problem areas by the subjects indicated that relations between officers and petty officers is considered to be one of the most critical problem areas. Hence it seems advisable to develop more situational problems involving officers and senior petty officers.

Although the subjects rated relations between petty officers and non-rated men as ninth in importance out of ten categories, it is the personal opinion of the researcher that this is a critical area. The discussions during the sessions indicated a gross lack of understanding or concern of the subjects for the ordinary non-rated man in the military today.

It is certainly possible that this was just talk and did not represent the true situation. However, the discussions indicated a distinct distrust of the motives of the "younger generation" sailor. Perhaps this attitude can be summed up by saying that until a man had reenlisted for the first time, he was one of "them"; after he had shipped over, he was one of "us". Accordingly, it seems feasible to direct more situational problems toward relationships between rated and non-rated men, particularly in view of the critical retention problem that exists.

In the description of the sessions it was mentioned that situations to be used were selected by the researcher from the AIR report. In one case a situation was specifically requested by a subject who was faced with a similar problem in his division. This session appeared to be more rewarding to the group because of the applicability of the problem. In using the AIR situations then it would seem advisable to allow the subjects to select problems that they wished to discuss. In more advanced programs it would be necessary for the group or group leader to prepare the situations to be used inasmuch as the AIR manual only contains fifteen situations.

The following is offered as one possible manner in which a station program could be set up. In order to maintain interest in a continuous station program it would provide variety to have a group of eight participants with two phased out each session to accomodate an equal number of new participants.

In this manner a group leader could start working with the initial group of two. The leader could explain the program and procedures to these two and tape a good example of role playing. For the next session the group would be augmented by two more participants who could be used as critics of the original material and aid in preparing additional situations. Similarly, the third and fourth pairs would be introduced to the program. When the fifth pair is added to the group, the first pair could be dropped, thus creating a cycle which provides for continuous training, new participants, and a variety of exposures to other attitudes.

In preparing situations or using prepared situations, it is definitely advisable to avoid mention of specific individuals at the local command. In the first place, this invariably leads to the telling of "sea stories" which detract from the discussion and secondly, it can lead to animosity between members of the group.

In Appendix II are samples of the behavior check lists which are included as part of the material prepared by AIR. These check lists were used for all the cases and copies prepared for all observers. Their use did not appear to add significantly to the discussion and in fact seemed to be a childish exercise which detracted from the mood of the sessions. For future role playing sessions it is recommended that a form similar to the discussion guide provided with the case studies be used (Appendix VII). This same discussion guide is recommended for use by the group leader whether or not the members

of the group use it.

It should be noted here that at no time did the researcher attempt to measure or detect any improvement in the performance of the participants of the role playing sessions. It was obvious from the start that time and personnel limitations would prevent any evaluation of role playing as a training tool except on a strictly empirical basis. The observations and recommendations are completely dependent upon the perception of the researcher who in the practical situation really has no other means of evaluation in any case. No doubt a number of items mentioned in this study could be the subject of further research. For example, it is curious that a participant who is rated fourth by the researcher should be selected as first in leadership ability displayed during the sessions, by his peers. This and other aspects of role playing not dealt with directly in this research are left to the more experienced psychologists and sociologists to explore.

IX. Future Uses

Leadership training sessions are often a source of satisfaction to military leaders because they provide some degree of insight into the attitudes behind the behavior of coworkers, be they subordinates, peers, or seniors. Role playing in its most elementary form can be nothing more than a glamorized group discussion. Yet this project has left the researcher with the impression that further efforts in the field of role playing in a suitable climate of leadership development can be

a very rewarding experience for the command and participants alike. While a limited background can be gained through reading about role playing, experience or participation in the technique is far more beneficial. While the necessity for developing leaders trained in role playing may hinder the program somewhat, it is hoped that application of role playing will be more extensive in the military in the future.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Argyris, Chris. Personality and Organization. New York: Harpet & Row, Publishers, 1957.
- Corsini, Raymond J. "Role Playing: Its Use in Industry," Advanced Management, XXV (February, 1960), 20-23.
- Culbertson, Frances. "Modification of an Emotionally Held Attitude Through Role Playing," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 54 (1957), 230-233.
- Fleishman, Edwin A. (ed.) Studies in Personnel and Industrial Psychology. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, Inc. 1961.
- Hepner, Harry Walker. Psychology Applied to Life and Work. Third Edition. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1962.
- Lawshe, C.H., R.L. Brune, and R. A. Bolda. "Role Playing as Supervisors See It," Supervisory Management, 3 (November, 1958), 60-61.
- Litterer, Joseph A. Organizations: Structure and Behavior. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1963.
- Maier, N.R.F. and Lester F. Zerfoss. "MRP: A Technique for Training Large Groups of Supervisors and its Potential Use in Social Research," Human Relations, 5 (1952), 177-186.
- Maier, Norman R. F. Principles of Human Relations. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1952., 1952.
- Maier, N. R. F., H. R. Solem, and A. A. Maier. Supervisory and Executive Development: A Manual for Role Playing. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1957.
- Mann, John H. "Experimental Evaluations of Role Playing," Psychological Bulletin, 53 (1956), 227-234.
- Melton, Arthur W. "Military Psychology in the United States of America," Proceedings: First International Symposium on Military Psychology. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council (1961), 109.
- Speroff, B. J. "The Substitution Method in Role-Playing Grievance Handling," Personnel Journal XXXIIX (May, 1959) 9-12.

"Training Manpower," Fortune (April, 1951), 154.

Trittipoe, Theresa G., and Clifford P. Hahn, Situational Problems for Leadership Training - Parts I-IV. Washington, D. C.: American Institute for Research, 1961.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

LIST OF SITUATIONAL PROBLEMS

(Trittipoe and Hahn, 1961)

Prob. Number	Roles	Brief Description of General Problem Situation	No. of Interviews	Order of Interviews and Initiator (in parentheses)
1	HMC Cutler HM2 Willis	Insubordination in getting the sick-bay cleaned	1	Chief
2	ETC Fillmore ET1 Harris ET2 Fields	Harris is trying to keep Fields from working on a big job coming up. Fields wants to work on it.	2	1)ET1 Harris (Chief) 2)ET2 Fields (Fields)
3	TMC Sprockett TM1 Green TM1 Wilson	Green is disturbed by the skylarking of one of Wilson's men. Wilson is annoyed by Green's complaints.	2	1)TM1 Green (Green) 2)TM1 Wilson (Wilson)
4	SFC Reynolds SFI Lawrence SFSN Johnson	Johnson wants more training. Lawrence does not want "green" men spoiling the work.	2	1)SFSN Johnson (Johnson) 2)SFI Lawrence (Chief)
5	YMC Bascomb YN3 Harlow YN3 Edwards	Harlow's and Edwards' work has slumped, due to routine, repetitive nature of the task.	2	1)YN3 Harlow (Chief) 2)YN3 Edwards (Chief)
6	BMC Fletcher BM1 Corey	Should a special "72" be awarded?	1	Corey
7	SKC Blake SK1 Delaney SK3 Cox	More overtime coming up unexpectedly. The men had planned to have time off before shipping out	2	1)SK1 Delaney (Chief) 2)SK3 Cox (Chief)
8	ADC Bauer AD2 Morley AD3 Hopkins	Bauer is responsible for a near accident on a test flight. His men have lost confidence in him.	2	1)AD2 Morley (Morley) 2)AD3 Hopkins (Chief)

List of Situational Problems (continued).

Prob. Number	Roles	Brief Description of General Problem Situation	No. of Interviews	Order of Interviews and Initiator (in parenthesis)
9	QMC Allen QM3 Hoover	Hoover is a good man and works overtime. He has come in late from liberty and deserves being put on report.	1	Hoover
10	CMAA O'Brien MAA Reed	Reed is very harsh in giving punishment and enforcing regulations.	1	Chief
11	EMC Wallace EM2 McKenzie EM3 Crawford	Crawford, who has more experience, was passed over and a promotion given to McKenzie	2	1)EM2 McKenzie (Chief) 2)EM3 Crawford (Chief)
12	CPO Conner MMC Shaeffer EM1 Thorndike	Shaeffer has "pulled rank" and ordered Thorndike to release one of his (Shaeffer's) men, while out on S.P. duty.	2	1)EM1 Thorndike (Thorndike) 2MMC Shaeffer (Chief)
13	ATC Nicholson AT2 Lee AT3 Parks	Lee has a "hard luck" Option-story and wants to receive flight pay out of turn. Parks objects to this.	Optional	Optional, would be initiated by Chief
14	AMC Simpson AM1 Larson	Larson is to receive low grades because of his failure to improve his performance.	1	Chief
15	YNC Corwin Ensign YN3 Grove	The Ensign has been giving Corwin's group work at such a time as to necessitate overtime. Corwin would like to have the Ensign bring the reports in earlier. Grove has been a loud complainer.	1	Chief initiates talk with Ensign; the inclusion of Grove is optional.

APPENDIX B

SAMPLE ROLE PLAYING SITUATIONAL PROBLEM

(Trittipoe and Hahn, 1961)

Problem #8

Chief Aviation Machinist's Mate

Role 1

(Bauer)

You are an ADC at a Naval Air Station. The day before yesterday there was a routine test flight on which you served as flight engineer. You had not felt well that morning and has almost reported to sick bay, but you hated to cancel out at the last minute and delay the flight. Shortly after take-off time one of the crew members reported heavy gas fumes. The pilot asked you if you could find the leak and correct it, and you told him that you weren't sure. All equipment except radio was secured, but the gas fumes were still present. To play it safe the pilot immediately burned back and arranged for an emergency landing at the Air Station. This caused a little excitement and some of the men from your outfit came around to see what had happened. The ground maintenance crew discovered a malfunction in the heating system. The maintenance crew leader stated that if you had secured the heaters properly, the highly dangerous situation of gas leakage would have been corrected. The men seemed a little shaken up by this and you felt you ought to say something, but what could you say. There really wasn't anything you could say, so you mentioned not feeling well, and got out of there as fast as you could.

You feel bad about the whole thing, especially since a somewhat similar incident occurred about three months ago. Although you had not been responsible then, the responsibility for that near accident was never set.

Yesterday you heard talk that AD3 HOPKINS, who had always talked about shipping over, had told some of the men that he had changed his mind. You feel that you ought to have a talk with him to try to convince him to ship over. He hasn't said anything to you about it, but you suspect that the incident of the other day might have something to do with his decision. You requested to see him. You also heard that A12 MORLEY, another one of your men and probably one of the best, is thinking about making a transfer chit. MORELY asked to see you this morning and you feel sure that it is about the transfer chit. You don't want to lose him because he is a good man. Besides you are somewhat concerned about what effect the loss of the two men might have on the rest of your men, especially coming so closely after the recent near accident. MORLEY is waiting to see you now, and HOPKINS is due in 10 minutes.

Aviation Machinist's Mate 2nd Class Morley

Role 2 - Problem #8

You are an AD2 at a Naval Air Station. On a routine test flight the day before yesterday, Chief Bauer who was acting as flight engineer, failed to secure the heaters properly which allowed a gas leak to continue that could have blown up the whole thing. Fortunately, the pilot was able to get back to the Air Station and make an emergency landing and no one was hurt. Quite a few of the fellows were around to see what happened and heard the Chief of the ground maintenance crew tell your Chief that if he had done what he was supposed to, right, the near accident wouldn't have happened. At first you were willing to chalk the whole thing off to human error until you noticed the negative attitude of the Chief. He merely mumbled something about not feeling good, and that the heater was probably defective anyway, and stalked off. In general, the Chief made a bad impression on everybody around by not readily admitting his mistake. It started you to thinking. Something similar had happened about six months ago. They never had been able to find out who had been at fault that time, but you recall that the Chief had been on the crew that time too. You wonder if the Chief was responsible that time too. You have decided to put through a transfer request. You know, of course, that this will have to go through the Chief and you are waiting to see him now with your chit. Your attitudes toward the situation are as follows:

- 1) You want a transfer. Your stated reason is that you desire duty on the West Coast. If the Chief doesn't accept this reason, hedge, by saying something like -

"There are a lot of reasons why I want to get out of this outfit."

If he keeps after you tell him you want a change of scenery or climate. Do not say anything about the near accidents unless the Chief does. If he brings up the near accident admit that that is your reason for requesting a transfer.

- 2) If the Chief brings up the near accident point out that:
 - a) You don't feel safe with him
 - b) You think his attitude was negative
 - c) The other men sympathize with your viewpoint
 - d) There was another similar accident about three months ago
 - e) There are plenty of other flying assignments in the Navy.

Aviation Machinist's Mate 2nd Class Morley (Continued).

Role 2 - Problem #8

- 3) Do not allow yourself to be talked out of a transfer unless you feel that the Chief does a really good job. Try to imagine your own real feelings under similar circumstances. If you don't feel truly convinced, insist on a transfer. If you really feel that what the Chief says would convince you to remain, were the situation a real one, tell him you'll hold up on the transfer chit for a while.

Aviation Machinist's Mate 3rd Class Hopkins

Role 3

You are an AD3 at a Naval Air Station. Your enlistment will be up in a couple of months and until recently you had thought you would ship over. You have talked to other fellows in our outfit about re-enlisting. You enjoy Navy life, flying, and the advancement opportunities available. Until this year you hadn't given much thought to the safety angle, but what with the increasing number of crashes reported in the newspapers, you began to wonder a little. Then on a routine test flight the day before yesterday, BAUER, the Chief, who was acting as flight engineer, failed to secure the heaters properly which allowed a gas leak to continue that could have blown up the whole thing. This endangered the lives of the whole crew. The pilot had managed to make it back to the Air Station and make an emergency landing and luckily no one was hurt. When the plane landed quite a few of the men were around to find out what had happened. The Chief of the ground maintenance crew found the trouble and told the Chief that if he had secured the heaters properly the dangerous leakage would have been corrected. The Chief made some kind of weak excuse about not having felt well that morning and that it must have been a defective heater anyway, and then he left the area as soon as he could. The whole thing reminded you of a somewhat similar incident that happened about six months ago. They never had been able to set the blame for that near accident, but the Chief had been on that crew too, and you begin to suspect that maybe his negligence may have been responsible that time too.

So you have told some of your buddies that you've changed your mind about shipping over. The Chief has asked to see you, so you suspect that he has gotten wind of this and that he probably knows the recent near accident has something to do with it, but you don't particularly care, especially since you know that AD2 MORELY, a good Navy man, is asking for a transfer from the outfit mainly because of what has happened.

You are waiting to see the Chief now. If he tries to convince you to ship over, your attitudes should be as follows:

- 1) You will accept your RFAD when it is due. If the Chief asks you why you changed your mind, say something like - "There are a lot of reasons why I want out of this outfit." If he keeps after you, tell him something like - "I can make more money on the outside"; "I want to go back to a civilian school"; "I want to try civilian life for awhile."

Do not say anything about the near accident unless the Chief does. If he brings up the near accident, admit that this is your real reason for changing your mind about staying in the Navy.

- 2) If the Chief brings up the near accident, point out that:
 - (a) You don't feel safe with him
 - (b) The other men sympathize with you - and AD2 MORELY is probably asking for a transfer
 - (c) There was a similar accident about 6 months ago
- 3) Do not allow yourself to be talked out of accepting your RFAD unless you feel that the Chief does a really good job. Try to imagine your own real feelings under similar circumstances. If you don't feel truly convinced, stick to your decision to accept the RFAD. If you really feel that what the Chief says would convince you to ship over were the situation a real one, tell him that you changed your mind too quickly and that you'll think the matter over seriously for several more days before deciding against a Navy career.

Problem #8 (Cont'd).

Behavior Check List

Chief & AD2

1. Greets MORLEY in a friendly manner _____
2. Asks MORLEY why he requested an interview _____
3. Interrupts MORLEY while he is explaining _____
4. Approved the transfer request and dismisses MORLEY immediately _____
5. Asks MORLEY why he wants a transfer _____
6. Probes until MORLEY mentions the near accident _____
7. Chief brings up matter of near accident _____
8. Asks for MORLEY's opinion of near accident _____
9. Avoids responsibility for near accident _____
10. Admits blame for near accident _____
11. Discusses implications of the transfer _____
12. Asks MORLEY to put himself in the Chief's position. _____
13. Tries to convince MORLEY that flying will be safer in future _____
14. Tries to convince MORLEY to wait awhile before requesting a transfer _____
15. Offers the transfer request after discussion _____

Chief Bauer

AD2 Morley _____

AD3 Hopkins _____

Rater's Name _____

Problem #8 (Cont'd)

Behavior Check List

Chief & AD3

1. Greets HOPKINS in a friendly manner _____
2. Asks HOPKINS if he has changed mind about shipping over _____
3. Asks HOPKINS what made him change his mind about shipping over _____
4. Interrupts HOPKINS while he is giving his answer _____
5. Probes until HOPKINS mentions the near accident _____
6. Brings up matter of near accident himself _____
7. Asks for HOPKINS' opinion of near accident _____
8. Avoids responsibility for near accident _____
9. Admits blame for near accident _____
10. Asks HOPKINS to put himself in the Chief's position _____
11. Tries to convince HOPKINS that flying will be safer in the future _____
12. Points out advantages of shipping over _____
13. Tries to convince HOPKINS to wait awhile before deciding definitely _____
14. Verbally approves of HOPKINS' decision to leave the Navy _____

Chief Bauer (ADC) _____

AD2 Morley _____

AD3 Hopkins _____

Rater's Name _____

APPENDIX C

DIRECTIONS FOR ADMINISTRATION OF PROBLEMS

(Trittipoe and Hahn, 1961)

1. The person who is to administer the problem(s) should familiarize himself, in advance, with the contents of the problems and with the Instructions for Administering Problems.
2. So that the men who are to participate in the problem situations will be properly prepared, the Instructions to Participants should be given to them before the session(s) begins.
3. So that the administration can be simple and uninterrupted all the materials needed for administering a problem - copies of roles, checklists, pencils, paper - should be assembled in advance.
4. Role assignments should, if possible, be made in advance. If more than one problem is to be administered in a session, make an effort to distribute the different tasks fairly equally. That is, let the observers of the first problem administered play the roles in the next problem.

APPENDIX D
INSTRUCTIONS TO PARTICIPANTS
(Trittipoe and Hahn, 1961)

General Procedure

At the beginning of each session, several of the members of your group will act out a situation in which the Chief will have to solve a problem. The sample checklist shown below, refers to the actions of the Chief during the acting out of the situation. Sometimes the Chief will have to interview several people in turn, in which case there is a separate checklist for each interview. Keep the following in mind:

1. The actual checklists which you will use will have somewhat different items, as appropriate to the problem situation from those shown in the sample. The items, however, will be of the same general kind as shown below.
2. Check each behavior (if it occurs) as it occurs.
3. The behaviors may not occur in the order shown on the checklists, so pay careful attention to the actions of the Chief during the acting out of the problems.

Sample Behavior Checklist

- | | |
|---|-------|
| 1. Greets Jones in a friendly manner | _____ |
| 2. Asks Jones why an interview was requested | _____ |
| 3. Interrupts Jones while he is explaining his problem | _____ |
| 4. Compliments Jones for his good work | _____ |
| 5. Explains the reasons which make granting Jones' request impossible | _____ |
| 6. Flatly refuses to grant Jones' request | _____ |

APPENDIX D (Cont'd)

Sample Behavior Checklist (Cont'd)

7. Loses his temper or raises his voice _____
8. Allows Jones to dominate the interview _____
9. Allows himself to be talked into granting Jones' request _____
10. Dismisses Jones at or before the end of 10 minutes _____

APPENDIX E

PROCEDURES FOR ADMINISTERING PROBLEMS (ROLE PLAYING) (Trittpoe and Hahn, 1961)

1. Announce role assignments for the session.
2. Give the appropriate role to each participant and instruct them to read over the role without making any comments or saying anything about the content of the roles.
3. Give observers (those with no role assignment for that session) one copy of each of the roles and of the Behavior Checklist(s) for that problem, and instruct them to familiarize themselves with the situation and the checklist(s).
4. After 5-10 minutes (or when participants and observers appear to have finished reading) ask individuals who have any questions to discuss the problem, asking those who remain behind not to discuss the problem while you are out of the room.
5. Procedure for beginning the role playing sequence:
 - a. Consult the List of Situational Problems to determine the number and order of interviews. If there is only one supporting player (beside the Chief) and hence, one interview, tell the two actors that they may begin when ready (Problems 1, 6, 9, 10, and 14). In the case of problems where successive interviews are to be held, and the order of interviews is specified in the problem, ask the actor who is to be interviewed

APPENDIX E (Cont'd)

Procedures for Administering Problems (Role Playing)

second to wait outside the room until he is called in and tell the other two players that they may begin when ready (Problems 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, and 12). In the case of Problems 13 and 15, where optional interviews occur, observe the following general procedure:

(1) Problem 13:

Ask both supporting players to step outside the room.

Ask the actor who is playing the Chief whether he wants to see the other men or if he wants to make a decision immediately.

If he elects to hold interviews, tell him to call in the man he wishes to see first.

(2) Problem 15:

Ask the supporting player who is taking YN3 Grove's role to step outside the room, and remain until he is called in.

Tell the man who is playing the Ensign's role to go outside and then come in about half a minute later and begin the sequence.

Tell the man who is playing the Chief that Grove will be outside if he wants to call him in later in the sequence.

- b. Remind observers to note whether they have the correct Behavior Checklist for the interview which is about to occur.

6. Do not make any attempts to terminate the role playing. When one or all of the actors make it clear that they have finished with the problem, say something like, "O.K., now

APPENDIX E (Cont'd)

Procedures for Administering Problems (Role Playing)

let's talk about what happened", or, "Well, what did you think of that one?"

(Collect checklists at this time)

7. Turn to the General Discussion Guide for Use with Role Playing Groups, and follow the procedure suggested for directing the discussion of the problem. This guide is not to be regarded as a rigid requirement, but rather, as a source of material for stimulating the discussion if it should lag or stray too far afield of the topic of the problem.
- 8 Towards the end of the session, you might consider if most of the matters mentioned in the discussion guide have, in fact, been covered, and if any minor gaps exist, bring these matters up.

APPENDIX F

GENERAL DISCUSSION GUIDE FOR USE WITH ROLE PLAYING GROUPS

(Trittipoe and Hahn, 1961)

1. Ask actors to summarize, in turn, their reactions to the problems.
 - a. Is Chief satisfied with results of his interview(s) - what does he feel the ultimate results of this situation will be?
 - b. Are other participants satisfied with the outcome - do they feel they were
 - (1) treated fairly?
 - (2) motivated in the direction desired by the Chief?
2. Go over each checklist item and discuss whether each is a "good" or "poor" behavior item and why. Be sure to cover the possible consequences of:
 - a. Exhibiting the behavior in question.
 - b. Not exhibiting the behavior in question.
3. Ask for examples of personal experiences to support notions or ideas which are mentioned.

APPENDIX G

Case Study #8

SAMPLE CASE STUDY

(Trittippoe and Hahn, 1961)

Chief Aviation Machinist's mate Bauer is stationed at a Naval Air Station. He recently served as flight engineer on a routine test flight. Before the flight he had felt ill but in order to avoid cancelling out at the last minute, had not reported to sick bay. Shortly after take off, heavy gas fumes were reported and all equipment except radio was secured, but still the gas fumes were present. To play it safe the pilot immediately turned back and arranged for an emergency landing at the air station.

When the plane landed the ground maintenance crew discovered a malfunction in the heating system. The maintenance crew leader stated that if the flight engineer had secured the heaters properly, the gas leakage would have been corrected. Several men from the Chief's outfit were around and they heard what was said. The Chief was embarrassed and left the scene without saying anything.

After this near accident the attitude of the men was visibly affected. Two examples were AD2 Morley who submitted a transfer request, and AD3 Hopkins who has decided not to ship over. The Chief, being concerned about the situation, decided to talk to both men.

During the talk with AD2 Morley the following points were made:

- 1) Morley wanted a transfer to get out of the Chief's outfit.
- 2) Morley did not feel safe with the Chief as a crew member.
- 3) The other men sympathized with Morley's viewpoint.

During the talk with AD3 Hopkins the following points were made:

- 1) Hopkins had previously planned to ship over, but due to the near accident was getting out of the Navy.
- 2) Hopkins did not feel safe with the Chief as a crew member.

APPENDIX G (Cont'd)

Case Study #8

3. The other men sympathized with Hopkins' viewpoint.

Discussion Guide

1. What are the specific problems which the Chief must solve?

Be sure to cover:

- a) Convincing the AD2, the AD3, and the rest of the crew that he is a safe person with whom to fly.
- b) Convincing the two men to remain in the outfit.
- c) The proper way for the Chief to explain the near accident without "loss of face" but at the same time to accept appropriate responsibility.

2. How can the Chief deal with each of these problems?

Be sure to cover:

- a) What should he do?
- b) What should he say?
- c) How should he follow up?

3. What are the difficulties confronting the Chief in dealing with this situation?

Be sure to cover:

- a) Appearing irresponsible if trying to "play down" the accident.
- b) Losing the confidence of subordinates if his negligence is over-emphasized.
- c) Receiving other transfer requests if he is unable to convince the two men to remain in the unit.

APPENDIX I
BACKGROUND QUESTIONNAIRE

NAME _____ RATE _____ NO. YRS. SVC _____

PRESENT BILLET _____

NUMBER OF PEOPLE YOU PRESENTLY SUPERVISE _____ MIL _____ CIV _____

Have you ever had any role playing experience? _____

If so, when? _____

where? _____

Do you believe role playing to be an effective training technique? _____

Do you feel that human relations skills are important for effective leadership? _____

Do you feel that as a leader you need additional training in leadership (human relations) skills? _____

Do you feel that your immediate subordinates need training in human relations skills? _____

What type of training (formal) do you think is most effective in teaching leadership? _____

APPENDIX I

SELF-EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

(Adapted from Trilittipoe & Hahn, 1961)

NAME _____

DATE _____

CHECK LIST OF TRAINING NEEDS

Please indicate below how you would rate your own level of ability in each of the techniques listed. Try to evaluate each technique independently of the others. In order to evaluate the results of this program it is requested that you be as frank and honest as possible. This list is strictly for this research project.

	Very effective	High	Aver.	Fair	Low	Very ineff.
Establishing rapport						
Gathering information						
Maintaining control						
Inspiring confidence						
Resolving conflicts						
Giving Instructions						
Providing guidance						
Providing reinforcement						
Encouraging Teamwork						
Acting decisively						
Delegating responsibility						
Rewarding accomplishments						
Showing interest in welfare of subordinates						
Organizing work						
Checking work of others						
Giving constructive criticism						
Following through						
Maintaining poise						

Note: Content of the above will not be used except for this research project without your express permission.

COMMENTS: Use reverse side of sheet

APPENDIX J

TERMINAL QUESTIONNAIRE

(Adapted from Trittipoe and Hahn, 1961)

NAME _____

Which member(s) of the group do you feel has much the same concept and methods of leadership as yourself? _____

Which member of the group do you feel has concepts and methods of leadership most different from your own? _____

From what you have observed at these meetings how would you rank the members of the group (yourself included) in leadership ability?

- | | |
|----|----|
| 1. | 4. |
| 2. | 5. |
| 3. | 6. |

From what you have observed in your day-to-day association on the job with the other members of the group, how would you rank the members of the group (yourself included) in leadership ability?

- | | |
|----|----|
| 1. | 4. |
| 2. | 5. |
| 3. | 6. |

If you had conducted the role playing sessions, what would you have done differently _____

The various categories of situations listed below are possible trouble areas in military leadership. Please rank these categories in what you feel is their order of importance by placing

APPENDIX J (Cont'd)

Terminal Questionnaire

in the blanks on the right, numbers from 1 to 10, 1 being the most important.

Making work assignments and schedules	_____
Supervising work gang activities	_____
Relations between officers and petty officers	_____
Relations between petty officers and other petty officers	_____
Relations between petty officers and non-rated men	_____
Training subordinates and peers	_____
AOL/AWOL	_____
Technical competence	_____
Emergency actions	_____
Personal actions in fulfilling job responsibilities	_____

thesY37

A study of the introduction of role play



3 2768 001 90513 6

DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY